

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCI United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	IO. F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/084,298	0/084,298 02/25/2002		Kenneth Jacobs	GI 5358 CIP	7985	
25291	7590	09/28/2004		EXAMINER		
WYETH	I 'LAW GRO	· ID	HUNNICUTT, RACHEL KAPUST			
	DA FARMS	_		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
MADISC	N, NJ 0794	40		1647		
				DATE MAILED: 09/28/200-	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		A1:4: N-						
		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action	C	10/084,298	JACOBS ET AL.					
Office Action	Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Rachel K. Hunnicutt	1647	<u> </u>				
The MAILING DATE Period for Reply	of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence ad	dress				
A SHORTENED STATUTO THE MAILING DATE OF T - Extensions of time may be available after SIX (6) MONTHS from the ma - If the period for reply specified abov If NO period for reply is specified at - Failure to reply within the set or extending the complete of the set or extending th	HIS COMMUNICATION. under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 ling date of this communication. e is less than thirty (30) days, a reply ove, the maximum statutory period ove the maximum statutory beriod to reply will, by statute or than three months after the mailing	36(a). In no event, however, may a y within the statutory minimum of th vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MO , cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered time! NTHS from the mailing date of this or BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	y. ommunication.				
Status			,					
1)⊠ Responsive to comm	unication(s) filed on <u>12 Ju</u>	<u>ıly 2004</u> .						
2a) This action is FINAL .		action is non-final.						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims								
 4a) Of the above clair 5) Claim(s) 17-20,43-59 6) Claim(s) 10,12,14,16 7) Claim(s) 13 is/are ob 	Claim(s) 10,12-14,16-20 and 34-62 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. Claim(s) 17-20,43-59 and 62 is/are allowed. Claim(s) 10,12,14,16,34-42,60 and 61 is/are rejected.							
Application Papers								
	n <u>25 February 2002</u> is/are est that any objection to the heet(s) including the correct	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ drawing(s) be held in abeya ion is required if the drawin	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CF	FR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119)	·						
12) Acknowledgment is m a) All b) Some * of 1. Certified copie 2. Certified copie 3. Copies of the of application from	ade of a claim for foreign c)☐ None of: s of the priority document s of the priority document	s have been received. s have been received in a rity documents have been u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National	Stage				
Attachment(s)				÷				
Notice of References Cited (PTC2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Information Disclosure Statement Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>0704</u> .	Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTC :	O-152)				

Art Unit: 1647

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

Applicant's amendment filed July 12, 2004 if acknowledged. Claims 1-9, 11, 15, and 21-33 have been canceled. Claims 14, 34-38, 40, and 42 are amended. Claims 46-62 are new. Claims 10, 12-14, 16-20, and 34-62 are pending and under consideration. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code, not included in this action can be found in a prior office action.

Claim Rejections/Objections Withdrawn

The objection to the specification regarding the required reference to priority documents is withdrawn in response to Applicant's amendment to the specification.

The objection to the specification regarding embedded hyperlinks is withdrawn in response to Applicant's amendment to the specification.

The objection to the specification regarding the use of trademarks is withdrawn in response to Applicant's amendments to the specification.

The rejection of claims 10, 12-14, 16-20, and 34-45 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dumoutier *et al.* or U.S. Patent No. 6,551,799 in view of Llorente *et al.* is withdrawn. The current application has a priority date of April 28, 1999 which predates the publication or filing dates of all of the cited references.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 10, 12, 14, 16, 34-42, and 60-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of treating arthritis, does not reasonably provide enablement for methods of treating all autoimmune disorders. The

Application/Control Number: 10/084,298

Art Unit: 1647

specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The factors considered when determining if the disclosure satisfies the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is undue include, but are not limited to:
1) nature of the invention; 2) state of the prior art; 3) relative skill of those in the art; 4) level of predictability in the art; 5) existence of working examples; 6) breadth of claims; 7) amount of direction or guidance by the inventor; and 8) quantity of experimentation needed to make and/or use the invention. *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Claims 10, 12, 14, 16, 34-42, and 60-61 are drawn to methods of treating autoimmune disorders. "Autoimmune disorders" encompasses rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, multiple sclerosis, myasthenia gravis, Crohn's disease, inflammatory bowel disease, lupus, diabetes, and psoriasis (claim 12). On p. 44 of the specification, Applicant states "an IL-22 inhibitor (such as an IL-22 antibody) can be used to treat an autoimmune disorder. Applicant goes on to list connective tissue disease, autoimmune pulmonary inflammation, Guillain-Barre syndrome, autoimmune thyroiditis, myasthenia gravis, graft-versus-host disease, and autoimmune inflammatory eye disease.

In Example 9, Applicant teaches that arthritic mice treated with an anti-IL-22 antibody showed significantly decreased symptoms relative to mice administered controls. The art is silent, however, to the involvement of IL-22 in other autoimmune disorders and whether administering anti-IL-22 antibodies would be useful in the treatment of any other autoimmune disorders. Interleukins have been implicated in a number of biological functions, and often it is not clear if they have beneficial or harmful effects. For instance, while it is known that IL-22 plays a role in inflammatory responses, and it may sometimes be beneficial to inhibit inflammatory responses, it has recently been shown that IL-22 plays a protective role in T cell-mediated hepatitis and it is a survival factor for hepatocytes (Radaeva *et al.* (2004), *Hepatology* 39(5): 1332-1342). Radaeva *et al.* teach that injection of concanavalin A (conA) and neutralizing IL-22 antibodies induced massive necrosis in the liver, whereas injection of conA alone led to spotted necrosis in the liver (p. 1335, column 1). Pretreatment with IL-22 almost completely prevented the massive necrosis of the liver. One of skill in the art would not know whether

Art Unit: 1647

inhibiting IL-22 would be successful in the treatment of any autoimmune disorder other than arthritis. Because of the lack of working examples, the breadth of the claims, and the lack of direction provided by Applicant, it would require undue experimentation by one of skill in the art to practice the invention as claimed without further guidance from the instant specification.

Conclusion

Claims 17-20, 43-59 and 62 are allowed.

Claim 13 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 17-20, 43-59, and 62 are rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachel K. Hunnicutt whose telephone number is (571) 272-0886. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback can be reached on (571) 272-0961. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RKH 9/24/04

JANET ANDRES
PRIMARY EXAMINE